UNITED STATES of AMERICA

DEPARTMENT of THE INTERIOR

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Public Scoping Meeting on Outer Continental Shelf Renewable Energy and Alternative Use Programmatic EIS

Thursday, June 8, 2006

The Presidio Officer's Club 50 Moraga Avenue, Moraga Room San Francisco, California 94129

PANEL MEMBERS

From the MMS: Maureen Bornholdt, Program

> Manager Maurice Hill Lynette Vesco

From ArgonneBob Moore, Facilitator

Program Coordinator/Manager Argonne NationalLaboratory: Environmental Sciences Division 200 Union Boulevard, Suite 530 Lakewood, Colorado 80228

From National Renewable Energy

Mike Robinson Labs:

The public scoping meeting came on the record at 6:32 p.m. per notice by Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, Illinois 60439.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Public Comments 61

Adjourns 70

1	general.
2	OPTI strongly encourages strongly
3	supports the development of properly-sited offshore
4	renewable energy.
5	As we commented on the Advanced Notice
6	of Proposed Rulemaking for the Offshore Renewable
7	Energy Program, MMS will achieve this goal most
8	efficiently and expeditiously if it first develops
9	regulations that protect the public trust and then
10	proceeds to consider individual projects based upon
11	a comprehensive and programmatic review of the site
12	selection the site location issues.
13	The rulemaking process that is the
14	subject of the PEIS and this hearing should not be
15	limited to wind power projects but most also include
16	other forms of renewable energy, such as tidal
17	power.
18	To fulfill this goal the following
19	actions must occur. MMS must ensure a comprehensive
20	programmatic review of resources. This resource
21	review should include an assessment of power
22	potential, wildlife and habitat, environmental
23	benefits and harms, and the presence of historical
24	recreational and cultural sites as well as public
25	safety issues.
26	It should be the basis for a development

1	use authorization framework, which protects the
2	marine environment and aids subsequent decisions.
3	MMS must have rigorous standard-setting
4	regulations. Renewable energy projects should not
5	be treated more leniently than other offshore-
6	development activities. Standards should include
7	requirements for independent environmental
8	assessments, best management practices, and best
9	impact mitigation practices, as well as ongoing
10	monitoring and funded decommissioning plans.
11	OPTI believes that it is essential for
12	MMS to apply its regulations consistently. The
13	underlying regulatory framework must be in place
14	first before any individual projects are considered.
15	Ocean management has for far too long
16	been left to ad hoc decisionmaking and development
17	agendas driven by profitmaking motives. One need
18	only look to the extreme conflict associated with
19	the Cape Wind Project in Nantucket Sound, where five
20	years have been wasted on an ill-considered review
21	process.
22	The problems and costs presented by
23	putting the specific project cart before the overall
24	underlying program horse should not be allowed to
25	continue. Renewable energy and environmental
26	protection will benefit by developing the

1	comprehensive program first.
2	The ocean is first and foremost a public
3	trust resource. Public interest, not private gain
4	must be the focus of MMS as it develops this PEIS
5	and programmatic regulation.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. MOORE: Thank you, Don.
8	Do you have anything you could leave
9	with us, a copy of your remarks?
10	MR. MOONEY: (Gives document to Mr.
11	Moore.)
12	MR. MOORE: Thanks a lot.
13	MR. MOONEY: You're welcome.
14	MR. MOORE: Okay. If anyone else would
15	like to provide us with some comments, it doesn't
16	matter whether you signed up when you came in to do
17	that. If you indicated no, it's okay if you change
18	your mind. We'd be more than happy to have you come
19	up and provide us with some comments.
20	Do I see any hands in the air? You take
21	this how about that. All right. Please state
22	your name and the organization you represent.
23	MR. LIGHTENER: I'm Tom Lightener. I'm
24	representing myself. I'm in the renewable energy
25	business.
26	I don't have any prepared remarks, but

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	in looking at the map out there of your central
2	coast planning region, there are a whole bunch of
3	constraint areas that seem to be off limits for your
4	study. You know, particularly the marine mammal
5	the Farallones Island.
6	And it just seems to me that, you know,
7	if our country is fairly serious about getting off
8	our oil addiction, like Bush says that we have, that
9	we need to look at all possible opportunities to
10	develop our natural resources our renewable
11	resource energy technologies.
12	And, you know, there was a good case
13	made tonight for how offshore wind, the potential is
14	great, and particularly in the shallower areas. And
15	I would just I know that the Energy Act excludes,
15	I would just I know that the Energy Act excludes, you know, public or national parks and marine
16	you know, public or national parks and marine
16	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way
16 17 18	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your
16 17 18 19	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your study.
16 17 18 19 20	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your study.  But if we don't look if we don't look
16 17 18 19 20 21	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your study.  But if we don't look if we don't look at these areas and look at the impacts of these
16 17 18 19 20 21	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your study.  But if we don't look if we don't look at these areas and look at the impacts of these areas, it's very possible, you know, that we could
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you know, public or national parks and marine mammal areas, but I and there's probably no way that you can incorporate those, you know, into your study.  But if we don't look if we don't look at these areas and look at the impacts of these areas, it's very possible, you know, that we could develop offshore wind in these areas and have

1	And I would just highly suggest that if
2	there's any way that you can look at some of these
3	areas that have been excluded from the legislation,
4	that I think it would be in the national interest.
5	Thank you.
6	MR. MOORE: Thank you very much.
7	Do we have any other speakers?
8	Anybody have any additional questions
9	they would like to ask of any of the presenters or
10	others on the panel?
11	Yes.
12	MR. STANLEY: Ryan Stanley, Pacific Gas
13	and Electric Company. For marine, I was just
14	curious on what kind of competitive considerations
15	you are going to look at during this process and how
16	how much of an open process when it comes to
17	applying for a new project that you envision.
18	MS. BORNHOLDT: That's a great question.
19	You know that's one of our struggles. This is not a
20	mature industry like oil and gas, so we don't know.
21	So I think the sky's the limit.
22	One of the things that was suggested to
23	us in the ANPR was not just looking at value, not
24	just looking at dollars as being the only indicator
25	of maybe that particular project when it's the
26	process, but taking a look at benefit. Benefit to

1	locality, benefit of using that particular resource
2	for electric, or whatever, generation.
3	So right now that's an open question.
4	We got some really good response in the ANPR. We're
5	going to take a look at obviously, you know, dollar
6	value. We're going to take a look also at operator
7	background. You know, has safe operator been out
8	there. Have they been a safe operator.
9	We'll also take a look at project. Is
10	that is that the best use of that particular
11	public land, so we haven't decided, but there's so
12	many things that we will consider.
13	MR. SMITH: This is Gary Smith. And
14	it's my understanding that most OCS projects now
15	require Corps of Engineers permits. And I wonder if
16	in your development of your regs you are going to
17	figure out some way to integrate whatever process
18	you have so that it isn't just an additional layer
19	but that somehow one process that works for all of
20	the federal permits required.
21	MS. BORNHOLDT: I guess the short answer
22	is yes. One of the things that I think is confusing
23	is when this section was enacted or the Amended
24	Lands Act that meant, oh, we didn't have to do all
25	these other things, but we will do. You're still
26	going to need your 404 permits. We're going to work

1	with the Corps on that, as well as all your other
2	compliance documentation, like Endangered Species
3	Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act requirements,
4	government-to-government consultation requirements.
5	So what we're trying to do is work as a
6	cooperative, if you would, be the lead agency.
7	Whatever documentation, environmental documentation,
8	like a site specific EIS, you know partner with the
9	Corps of Engineers so that particular document can
10	be done in a manner that addresses their issues,
11	that can be used as part of the consultation for
12	Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection
13	Act. Work with EPA if there are some discharge
14	issues or air issues. So hopefully have that Corps
15	document address those issues so we don't have to
16	have layer after layer in an inefficient system.
17	You know that's an idea. That's what we're going to
18	strive for. Yeah.
19	MR. MOORE: Anyone else have a question?
20	Good opportunity.
21	Okay, hearing no other questions, seeing
22	no hands in the air, was there one?
23	MS. BORNHOLDT: No.
24	MR. MOORE: Do you folks have any
25	questions for the people in the audience?
26	Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate

1	your coming here. Hope you had a chance to look
2	over this wonderful facility, a little bit, in
3	addition to the materials related to the
4	Programmatic EIS. Thanks again. Good night.
5	MS. BORNHOLDT: Oh, one last comment.
6	The NREL presentation that Mike gave, if you go to
7	the Argonne National Lab website that's listed on
8	the poster, we're going to update that and make sure
9	that this version, that has more of the current
10	information will be put on there, as well as the
11	mms.gov website will also have this too, so that way
12	folks that were interested
13	MR. MOORE: He's so famous he's already
14	getting phone calls.
15	MS. BORNHOLDT: I know. Thank you.
16	(The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	